



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	Elk Grove Water District	<b>County</b>	Sacramento
<b>Project Title</b>	Groundwater Protection through Well Destruction	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 200,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 220,221.00

**Project Description:** EGWD (EGWD) proposes to destroy four decommissioned wells in the EGWD service area, thereby removing four potential conduits for contamination to the groundwater basin.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	6
Budget	2
Schedule	3
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>28</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority GWMP was formally adopted by the Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Authority in February 2006, as shown in the final meeting minutes dated November 8, 2006.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant offers a fairly complete, detailed description of the proposed project, including the goals of the proposal, needed facilities and their location. Some of the information, such as location, was included in other sections of the application package, outside of the project Description. The application falls short of supplying an adequate explanation that details how EGWD will collaborate with other local agencies with regard to the management of the affected groundwater basin, simply indicating that it has up-to-date and accurate permits from Sacramento EMD for the wells to be abandoned, and that it participates as a representative on the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority. Although the project is technically feasible, the applicant does not demonstrate what definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management will be obtained that is consistent with the goals and objectives of the GWMP. Although the Applicant states that the project will protect and enhance the groundwater basin, the Applicant does not offer a clear explanation how this objective will be achieved with the abandonment of these four wells.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. Although the Applicant's Work Plan (WP) describes in sufficient detail what will be done and what the product will be, it is not consistent with the Schedule or Budget nor is broken down to the task level. It is difficult to recognize how the work will be completed in a technically adequate manner. Although the applicant mentions in the Description that they will post information about the project and its benefits on their website, they do not explain in the WP how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, agencies, and other interest parties. The Applicant indicates that well destruction permits will be obtained from Sacramento County to perform the necessary work and that the project qualifies for a Class 1 exemption from CEQA.
- **Budget:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The Budget lacks adequate explanation to show that details and assumptions are realistic, and cost effective in meeting the proposal's objectives. The Budget is not consistent with the WP or Schedule. The cost share and grant share amounts for project engineering design are not reflected in the explanation of budget item calculations, so it is impossible to know which costs the grant is covering. The documentation for hourly rates and number of hours for non-construction tasks does not support the values in the budget table.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **Schedule:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant's Schedule appears to be realistic but is not consistent with the work plan and budget, as the tasks and subtasks listed do not agree with those in the WP and Budget. The applicant does not present information defining how the Schedule was derived. The Applicant does not provide any assurance that it will be ready to proceed once a grant agreement is executed.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. A professional engineer will be on site regularly to monitor the project to ensure that the Work Plan is closely adhered to by the well drilling contractor. Also, a district representative will be on site to monitor, inspect, and record a daily field log during the project. The Sacramento County EMD will be involved in the project to insure that the proposed well destructions meet requirements. Also, EGWD will provide Sacramento County EMD with verification that the minimum volume of sealing material for each per well is used to seal the wells. Standard methodologies will be used such as following codes, standards, and recommendations from the California Water Code, DWR bulletins and County codes.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Applicant summarizes several projects that were performed over the last 5 years and states that the projects were completed on time and within budget, or that all project requirements were met. The Applicant does not, however, provide back-up documentation to support this by providing, for example, past performance evaluations from the grantor agency.